APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,501	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003041	8690

21967   7590   06/02/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/883,501	BEDELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*15 March 2005*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/15/2005</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 03/15/2005

to the original application filed 06/19/2001; IDS filed 04/15/2005.

2.   Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the
examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions
covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37
CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later
invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35
U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **McCann et al.** (U.S. 5,963,939 – issued 10/1999).

As to independent claim 9:

a.   McCann teaches a method for resolving reports that include prompt objects *(e.g.,*

the question block objects; col.23, lines 34-62), wherein the prompt objects

comprise a question to be asked of a user *(e.g., objects to prompt a user for responses that provide information to the question block; col.23, lines 30-62)* and at least one validation property *(e.g., searchable fields or properties; col.23, line 63-col.4, line 6 and also see Fig.9)*, the method comprising the steps of:

(i)   receiving a report instance at a server system from a client *(Fig.45)* that has initiated report execution of the report that includes one or more prompt objects *(items 556 and 558 in Fig. 45)*;

(ii)   gathering at the server system the one or more prompt objects referenced in the report *(item 562 in Fig.45)*;

(iii)   generating a resolution object *(e.g., generating a Solutions Object 400a; col.7, lines 51-63 and Fig. 22F)* containing the one or more questions from the one or more prompt object gathered *(e.g., the Question Block Base Class 100; col.23, lines 30-43 and Figs. 58A-58V)*; and

(iv)   interacting with a user to receive answers to one or more questions *(e.g., question block 'user interface' objects ...obtaining the needed information from the user ... the user enters data in response to questions; col.23, lines 35-62 and Figs. 58A-58V)* in the resolution object.

b.   While McCann does teach a report having prompt objects and receiving answers from a user to the one or more questions in the resolution object *(see Fig. 57)*, McCann does not explicitly teach "executing".

c.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have applied McCann's teaching to include executing the

report because it would have provided the capability for allowing the user to

submit over the Internet all or some of products that they desire to purchase to the

manufacturer, supplier, or distributor.

d.   The fact that McCann's teachings "submit purchase order" (Fig. 57) and purpose

of submitting purchase order in McCann suggests "executing".

As to dependent claim 10:

McCann teaches gathering prompt objects comprise using an object server to retrieve the

prompt objects from a metadata repository *(col.69, lines 21-41)*.

As to dependent claim 11:

McCann teaches merging multiple instances of the same prompt object in a report to

provide a single question for those prompt objects in the resolution object *(col.24, lines*

32-51 and col.66, lines 31-41).

As to dependent claim 12:

McCann teaches receiving an answer to the single question for multiple instances of the

same prompt and apply the answer to each instance of the prompt object in the report

(Fig.45).

As to dependent claim 14:

McCann teaches report instance comprises one or more origin application objects that

include the prompt objects *(e.g., objects to prompt a user for responses that provide*

information to the question block; col.23, lines 30-62); and wherein the resolution server

uses the resolution object to generate filled in application objects with the answers from

the resolution object in place of prompts objects in the origin application object *(col.7,*

line 51-col.8, line 2 and col.15, line 46-66).

As to dependent claim 15:

McCann teaches prompting the user to answer the questions from the prompt object

server over a web interface *(col.25, lines 22-41 and Figs. 58A-58V, a set of question*

procedures).

As to independent claim 1:

It is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 9, and is similarly rejected

under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 2:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

As to dependent claim 3:

McCann teaches the report prompt interaction means is part of a client system connected

over a network to a server system *(col.27, lines 41 and col.52, lines 37-42)*, and the

server system comprises the receiving means, the report server, the object server, and the

report execution means *(Fig. 57)*.

As to dependent claim 4:

McCann teaches the report prompt interaction means comprises a web server that

interaction with a user (col.23, lines 30-62 and *col.25, line 62-col.26, line 7)*.

As to dependent claims 5-8:

They include the same limitations as in claim 11-14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 16:

It is directed to a medium for implementing the method of claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 17:

It includes the same limitations as in claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 18:

McCann teaches merging multiple instances of the same prompt object in a report to provide a single question for those prompt objects in the resolution object *(col.24, lines 32-51 and col.66, lines 31-41);* and receiving an answer to the single question for multiple instances of the same prompt and apply the answer to each instance of the prompt object in the report *(Fig.45).*

As to dependent claim 19:

McCann teaches a process to generate filled in application objects with the answers from the resolution object in place of prompts objects in the origin application object *(col.7, line 51-col.8, line 2 and col.15, line 46-66).*

As to dependent claim 20:

McCann teaches a web server to interact with the user to obtain answers to one or more prompt questions *(e.g., obtain a client identifier from the user ... includes questions and other processes ... at the user's browser; col.25, line 62-col.26, line 7).*

4.   Claims 7 and 13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McCann et al. in view of **Poggi** (U.S. 6,569,205 – filed 07/1997).

As to dependent claims 7 and 13:

    a.   McCann does not explicitly teach "the report server checks for cached reports

prior to report execution."

    b.   Poggi teaches the report server checks for cached reports prior to report execution

(col. 4, lines 37-49 and Fig.6).

    c.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Poggi and McCann because it

would have provided the capability for presentation and navigation in a computer

system that includes multiple reports about multiple components.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

    a.   Applicant argues that *McCann does not disclose or suggest "receiving a report*

instance from a client has initiated report execution of the report that includes

one or more prompt objects "... MacCann does not disclose or suggest a

"report". (Remarks, page 7, 1st para.)

In response, fig.45 in MacCann describes receiving a report instance from a client

has initiated report execution of the report that includes one or more prompt

objects. After providing in information for 556 and 558, the user will "report" their information to a server by clicking 562.

b.   Applicant argues that *McCann does not disclose or suggest "gathering the one or more prompt objects referenced in the report."* (Remarks, page 7, 2nd para.) In response, McCann does teach gathering the one or more prompt objects referenced in the report. The server will receive the information after 562 is clicked at the client.

c.   Applicant argues that *McCann does not disclose or suggest "generating a resolution object the one or more questions from the one or more prompt objects gathered."* (Remarks, page 7, page 7, last para.) In response, McCann does teach generating a resolution object *(e.g., generating a Solutions Object 400a; col.7, lines 51-63 and Fig. 22F)* containing the one or more questions from the one or more prompt object gathered *(e.g., the Question Block Base Class 100; col.23, lines 30-43 and Figs. 58A-58V).*

d.   Applicant argues that *McCann does not disclose or suggest "executing the report upon receiving answers from a user to the one or more question in the resolution object."* (Remarks, page 8, 2nd full para.) In response, fig.57 in MacCann do read-on "receiving answers from a user to the one or more question in the resolution object". Also, McCann suggests "executing" (submit purchase order in fig. 57). The claim language should clarify whether "executing" is performed by the client or by the server.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schmonsees et al.   U.S. Patent No. 5,842,221   issued: Nov. 24, 1998

Machiraju et al.   U.S. Patent No. 6,028,601   issued: Feb. 22, 2000

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 27, 2005

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
May 31, 2005